

Again, his insistence that Douglas was right in lying to a court because that court represented what the witness characterized as tyrannical oppressors is indicative of a viewpoint that might permit his conscience to misstate facts if they did not favor his side. His explanation that the American revolution was not in a real sense a revolution because the colonists were oppressed by England casts some doubt on his definitions of revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Moreover, these definitions are not in accord with those which appear in the Classics. The evasiveness of Aptheker's testimony, and the distorted viewpoint, indicated above, renders extremely questionable what he says concerning Marxism-Leninism and the Classics and the extent to which they apply to the CPUSA.

Respondent's witness Gates adds little to the meaning to be given to Marxism-Leninism. He says it is a social science (R. 14353, 15032, 15360). He says that the CPUSA is an independent and completely autonomous organization (R. 15044). Concerning the Classics, he states that while *Problems of Leninism* has been used for teaching in the CPUSA schools, it is taught as historical writing and not as a blueprint or an order for Communists to follow all over the world and that it is not the program of the CPUSA (R. 15250).

Witness Flynn states that the Classics have been and are used in the Party schools as of the date of her testimony (June 26, 1952) but as reference books for history, and for the principles of Marxism-Leninism (R. 15968-15971).

The witnesses for Petitioner,¹ all of whom, as Party members, had some instruction in the meaning of Marxism-Leninism and some of whom were officials, writers or teachers for the Party, agree with Respondent's witnesses only to the extent that one of the component parts of Marxism-Leninism is the philosophic-sociological concept that capitalism must and will inevitably be superseded by a dictatorship of the proletariat which will eventually be succeeded

¹ Whose testimony we accept in this connection.

by a stateless class of society known as Communism. This original Marxist doctrine, they state, has superimposed on it the revisions and the supplementations of Lenin, Stalin, Dimitrov, and others which provide it with plans, policies, programs and directives to bring about the end of the present capitalistic era, designated as "imperialism", on a world-wide scale and by any means, including force and violence. The effort to bring about the dictatorship of the proletariat is an integrated effort of the working classes in all countries and the leadership thereof is in the Soviet Union, where it has succeeded.

Witness Lautner states (J.A. 970): "The leader of the world Communist movement is the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin . . . And the Party he represents". He says adherence to Marxism-Leninism has implicit in it complete subservience on the part of all Communist Party organizations, whether in the United States or elsewhere, and on the part of the individual members in all strategic and most tactical matters, to the rulers of the Soviet Union. The CPUSA adheres to Marxism-Leninism and consequently its Constitution is no more than a by-law (J.A. 979) to Marxism-Leninism and has no validity except insofar as it conforms thereto. Petitioner's witness Badenz, a former Party member and Editor of the *Daily Worker* testified (J.A. 1152-1153) when asked the meaning of the first sentence of the Party's 1945 Constitution (which sentence is identical with the first sentence of the 1948 constitution):

"Marxism-Leninism is a well-known and historical term in the Communist documents and discussions. It is that interpretation of so-called scientific socialism based on the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and which holds as the goal of the Communist Parties of the world the necessity for the violent shattering of the bourgeois states in order to set up in

¹ The record discloses no basis for any inference that the death of Stalin will terminate, lessen, or otherwise affect the domination of Respondent by the USSR.

their place a completely new state machinery, the dictatorship of the proletariat. This shall be achieved under Marxism-Leninism through the Party of the new type, the Bolshevik Party under Bolshevik discipline, which rejects the concept of class peace" (J.A. 1153).

He goes on to state that the Communists in the United States at that time (1945) regarded the American government as a bourgeois state and that further statements in the Preamble concerning the Communist Party's defense of the United States Constitution were not reconcilable with the sentence above quoted. He goes on to say:

"The statements cannot be reconciled. The dedication of Marxism-Leninism is the dedication historically and categorically to the violent shattering of the bourgeois state as the necessary step toward progress, and this other language in the light of that, since Marxism-Leninism principles prevail, is merely a window-dressing for legal protective purpose. It is part of the Aesopian language recommended by Lenin"¹ (J.A. 1153-1154).

He states further that the Classics were used in his work up to the time he left the Party (October 1945 (J.A. 1160-1161)). Speaking of his use of Aesopian language, he states:

"I referred to Marxism-Leninism. I referred to Stalin as the leader, teacher and guide, things of that sort, which was Aesopian to the extent that it presented Stalin as the leader, teacher, and guide, but didn't explain that he completely controlled the Communist movement, although I could have done it because Bittelman had stated in Milestones that Stalin was the leader, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the leader" (R. 13304).

¹ For a definition of "Aesopian", see "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" (Ex. 140, p. 7, n. 1, J.A. 1518, fn. 1).

He says, concerning Communist activity in the trade union movement: "No Communist is permitted to deviate from the line set down for the Communists of the world" (R. 14330). Petitioner's witness Lautner, former Party member leader and teacher, tells what he was taught concerning the meaning of Marxism-Leninism, and at J.A. 947, states:

"Marxism-Leninism taught us that monopoly capitalism or imperialism was a world-wide phenomenon, therefore there is need of a world-wide organization, an organization that has ties to successfully cope with this problem and eventually bring about the downfall of monopoly capitalism and imperialism."

Further, that the *Program of the Communist International* (Ex. 125, J.A. 1446-1472) was used by him in classes in 1947, 1948 and 1949 "because the program of the Communist International lays down the strategic aims of the Communist Parties" (J.A. 954).

Another witness for Petitioner, Meyer, said he taught Marxism-Leninism in Respondent's schools and that it was a body of doctrine which is first a philosophy of history, secondly, a guide to the Communist Party on the basis of that philosophy, in carrying out its historical role which is the overthrow of the capitalist system and its replacement with dictatorship of the proletariat to establish socialism which is to lead to the stage of Communism (J.A. 733). Petitioner's witness Philbrick, states he was taught this, and that the lessons of Marxism-Leninism were to be applied to present day affairs as a guide to action (J.A. 758 et seq.).

The witnesses for the Petitioner aver that the Classics represent a body of living doctrine and directives by which the Communists throughout the world are guided and governed. Witness Meyer testified (J.A. 689-691, 730) that the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Ex. 330, J.A. 1613-1632) was used on a living guide to revolutionary action based on the experience of

the Bolsheviks and the writings of Lenin and Stalin. He points to a speech by Trachtenberg made in Washington, D. C., in 1949, which declares that the leaders must know the Classics and be able to apply the basic principles to any current situation at any time (J.A. 748). Witness Matusow says, by way of example of current applicability of the Classics that the *Communist Manifesto*, (Ex. 31, J.A. 1339-1342), though 100 years old, "is just as relevant today as it was in 1848 when it was written." He goes on to say that this was so of other pieces of Marxist literature, pointing out particularly *The Young Generation* by Lenin, written in 1905 and used extensively in the Labor Youth League in 1949 (J.A. 1057). The Classics were in use by the CPUSA, to his knowledge, as of December 1950 (J.A. 1048-1049). Witness Evans says the Classics were used in the Marxist-Leninist Institute from April 1949 to June 1950 (J.A. 1104-1107). Witness Budenz testified (J.A. 1166-1167) that Trachtenberg, head of the cultural commission in charge of the direction of Communist cultural activities and in charge of the Party's general publishing field, stated he was not permitted to issue any Marxist literature, especially the Classics, without the authorization of the Marx Institute in Moscow. The *Daily Worker* used the Classics in its work (J.A. 1160, 1161). He states that Dennis recommended: "A thorough return throughout the Party to the Marxist-Leninist Classics, particularly to the writings of Stalin, the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Foundations of Leninism, and Dimitrov's Report to the Seventh Congress, which dealt with the true nature of how to conduct the United Front while forwarding the Communist revolutionary aims" (J.A. 1145-1146). While writing for the *Daily Worker* (from 1935 to 1945), Budenz did not directly advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. This was done by reference to Marxism-Leninism and the Classics (J.A. 1185-1186). Witness Lautner testified that on the basis of the Classics, at the National Training School in 1941, he was taught how Lenin applied Marxism to the epoch of imperialism and estab-

lished a party of a new type; how Stalin applied this to the party as a force, the leading political party of the working class; that Marxism-Leninism was a guide to action in the party in the United States; that the aim of the party was to gain political and economic power in this country and that this was to be accomplished, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, by a world-wide organization (J.A. 943-947).

From the Classics themselves, it is clear that force and violence was deemed necessary for the overthrow of the government of the Czars by the Russians. It is also clear that they call for international action by the working class in other countries so that Russia, when freed from the Czars would not be left standing in a hostile bourgeois world alone and friendless. The Classics definitely call for action on an international scale. It is the contention of the Respondent that the call to aid the Soviet Union was only applicable when the Soviet Union was weak and struggling; now that it is strong such international action on her behalf is not necessary. Is this so? It is clear that, in the period of the Communist International, the Classics were admittedly meant to be applied as the basic law of all Communist Parties, in every country where such parties existed. Under this basic law, the Soviet Union was the leader of a world organization of all such Communist Parties, in a world-wide movement to emancipate the working class from capitalist rule, so that directives, programs, and policies by which this was to be accomplished were clearly set forth in such Classics. Deviation therefrom was considered heresy and not to be tolerated.

While Marxism-Leninism is allegedly dynamic, there is no internal evidence in the portion of this amorphous amalgam which has been reduced to writing, and has become known as the Classics, which indicates a change in its character to make it inapplicable to the CPUSA. On the contrary, Petitioner's witnesses have established that the Classics are in current use and are applicable to the Party. Dr. Aptheker admits that no CPUSA member has altered the fundamental precepts of Marxism-Leninism.

We find the testimony of the witnesses for Petitioner, concerning Marxism-Leninism credible and in accord with the meaning thereof to be obtained from a reading of the record as a whole.

We find that the testimony of the witnesses for the Respondent concerning Marxism-Leninism is in and of itself, and in the context of the record as a whole, unrealistic, apologetic rather than explanatory, and not credible, except as to the origins of Marxism-Leninism and, generally speaking, that its objectives are the attainment of a socialist state under a dictatorship of the proletariat and an eventual classless state of society known as Communism.

How Marxism-Leninism is understood used and followed, by Respondent has been established in the discussion of the testimony of the witnesses, above. In addition thereto, consideration has been given to the numerous exhibits which shed light on the above question. From them it further appears that Respondent, its leaders and its members, taught, studied, discussed, used and applied the Classics in the manner intended by the authors of these Classics and to an extent incompatible with any claim that the Classics are not binding upon them in all fundamentals.

One of the most important, if not the most important, of the Classics in the period under examination in this proceeding, is the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Ex. 330, J.A. 1613-1632).¹ A reso-

¹ Witness Meyer's testimony on this point (J.A. 689) is sufficiently significant to warrant quotation here:

"THE WITNESS: The fundamental textbooks used before the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared—that must have appeared late in 1939, but I can't date it exactly. I can date it by epoch. It appeared during that general 1939 to 1940 epoch but I think it appeared in late 1939 or it might have been early 1940. At any rate before that appeared the major textbooks used, at the core of the whole problem—there were others used but the essential ones always were the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Foundations of Leninism by Stalin. The whole course of Marxism-Leninism was organized around these two. Then, so to speak, radiating from them were special problems: Lenin's State and Revolution, Lenin's Imperialism, Stalin's Problems of Leninism. I should say these were the central ones, except at one point also, I think in the earlier part of this period primarily, there were three rather

lution, adopted August 10, 1939, signed by the Communist Parties of France, Great Britain, the United States, Germany and Italy, (Ex. 296), states, *inter alia* (p. 73):

"The appearance of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* is one of the greatest events in the life of the Communist world movement and of the international labor movement, in the struggle of the working people of all countries for emancipation. Written with the immediate participation of Comrade Stalin and authorized by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (B.), the *History* occupies an extraordinary place among the classic works of Marxism-Leninism. The *History* is intended to play—and will undoubtedly play—a very important role in the successful mastering of Bolshevism by the Communists of the capitalist countries, in the consolidation of the Sections of the Communist International, and in raising their ideological and political level" (J.A. 1601-1602).

A reading of the exhibit as a whole is enlightening concerning the use of the Classics advocated by Respondent and the position they are given in the propagation of Marxism-Leninism. At page 83 it states:

"(g) The work of the publishing houses is to be so organized that, besides the contemporary agitational literature, they not only publish the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, but also strive to achieve for them the very widest distribution" (J.A. 1608).

widely used textbooks of excerpts from the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. One was called Strategy and Tactics, another the Theory of the Proletarian Revolution, and another one the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. After the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared it became the Central Textbook."

Not only are the Classics given wide distribution but they are also integral in the teachings and activities of the Respondent.²

Consequently, we conclude that the Classics are one of the chief means by which the CPSU directs, dominates, and controls the CPUSA.

From a review of the Classics and of the testimony, we make the following findings concerning Marxism-Leninism as it is understood, used and followed by Respondent:

Marxism-Leninism is a composite of the doctrines, dogmas and guides to action of Marx and Engels, as supplemented and revised by Lenin, Stalin and others, which advocates a world-wide revolutionary movement. The objective of the movement is the destruction of capitalism (which it designates as "imperialism"). It asserts as its ultimate goal a stateless class of society which it designates as Communism. The first step toward this end is the attainment of a socialist state under a dictatorship of the proletariat. "Proletariat" generally is synonymous with "working class". But, "a dictatorship of the proletariat" connotes the rule by a minority in the name of the working class. Such a dictatorship should, theoretically, come about by a nonviolent revolution which would evolve from natural economic change. Actually, Marxism-Leninism requires that such revolution be hastened by action. This action must be taken by a dedicated group of revolutionaries banded to-

² Some of the instances of the use of various of the more important Classics in evidence appears from the following exhibits which refer to study outlines, reading lists, school curricula, sales lists of Marxist literature and advertisements. It should be noted that these represent use of the items in years 1948 and 1949 and 1950. *Foundations of Leninism* (Ex. 121) Exs. 339, 346, 351, 369, 370, 416, 419, 420, 424, 425, 427; *Problems of Leninism*—Stalin (Ex. 138) Exs. 370, 416, 419; *State and Revolution*—Lenin (Pet. Ex. 139) Exs. 346, 370, 424; *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*—Lenin (Ex. 140) Exs. 339, 346, 369, 370, 419, 425, 427; *Communist Manifesto*—Marx and Engels (Ex. 31) Exs. 339, 351, 369, 370, 420, 424; *The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution* (Ex. 422) Exs. 419, 425, 427; *The United Front, The Struggle Against Fascism and War* (Ex. 139) Exs. 346, 420, 424, 427; *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Ex. 8) Ex. 7; *Mastering Bolshevism*—Stalin (Ex. 335) Exs. 370, 416; *What Is To Be Done?* (Ex. 417) Exs. 346, 370, 416, 420, 424.

gether as a so-called political party; the Communist Party. Under the leadership of the Soviet Union, this Party shall bring about, by force and violence if necessary, dictatorship of the proletariat in every country of the world whenever circumstances shall permit. Marxism-Leninism includes within itself the plans and procedures to accomplish this end. Adherence to its principles involves acceptance of its doctrines, tenets and obligations; and membership in the world revolutionary movement mentioned above. Marxism-Leninism contemplates the Communist Party of the United States as part of the world Communist movement. The name Marxism-Leninism is frequently applied in an esoteric sense to conceal from the uninitiated the full implications of such adherence and membership.

We proceed to examine the record as to Respondent's basic policies and activities to determine the extent to which they are formulated and carried out pursuant to Marxism-Leninism as hereinbefore defined; the extent to which such policies and activities reflect compliance in their formation and execution with other directives or instructions of the Soviet Union; and, the extent to which such policies and activities have as their purpose the furtherance of the policies of the Soviet Union and the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement. We treat first with the voluminous evidence concerning what Respondent and other Communist Parties throughout the world Communist movement constantly term the "struggle against imperialism", and with Respondent's participation in such "struggle".

3. Imperialism

The record establishes and we find that among the major activities of Respondent are teaching, advocacy, and agitation in opposition to what Respondent calls United States imperialism. This includes programs and activities such as "the struggle for peace"; the doctrine of "just and unjust wars"; the theory that the world is divided into two hostile camps, one led by the Soviet Union and the other by

the United States; and, the necessity of overthrowing existing "imperialist" governments by force and violence if necessary.

The record further establishes, and therefore we find, that a basic objective of the Soviet Union and of the world Communist movement is to bring about the downfall of the so-called "imperialist" countries including the United States believing that in so doing, several coveted objectives will be achieved; protecting and defending the Soviet Union, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the various countries, centralizing of all power—political, economic, and social—in the Communist Parties.

Upon consideration of the evidence hereinafter summarized and upon the entire record, we further find and conclude that Respondent's teachings, advocacy, and agitation as above stated have as their objective and purpose the advancement of the world-Communist movement; and they are formulated and carried out on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and other directives and instructions from the Soviet Union. We proceed to review the more significant evidence establishing the foregoing findings.

Respondent's witness Dr. Aptheker says there never was a period when the Communists of the United States ceased to characterize the United States Government as imperialist, and that the United States with its social system and ruling class, fits the definition of imperialism as given by Lenin and as adopted by Respondent (J.A. 1273-1274). Typical of Respondent's position in this respect is the following quotation from an article appearing in the January 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* (J.A. 1721):

"* * * U. S. imperialism is the most reactionary force in the world today, seeking to fascize, not only America, but every capitalist country" (Ex. 378, p. 9).

Additional illustration is furnished by an article by Betty Gannett published in the February 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* (Ex. 376, pp. 183-194) which emphasizes that the United States is imperialist and is plotting a new world

war (J.A. 1713); that "one of the main pillars of U. S. imperialism is its anti-Sovietism" (J.A. 1713) whereas the Soviet Union is for peace, is not an aggressor, and, being a workers' state, cannot and does not pursue an imperialist course (J.A. 1713-1714). The oral and documentary evidence establishes convincingly that Respondent has consistently characterized the United States as an "imperialist" nation. This fact, standing alone, is not disputed on the record.

We proceed to review the evidence and make our findings concerning why Respondent teaches, advocates, and agitates against what it calls American imperialism. The *Communist Manifesto* (Ex. 31, p. 9) declares that society as a whole is splitting into two great hostile camps, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (J.A. 1340). Lenin in *Imperialism* (Ex. 140, pp. 9, 11, 126) designates capitalism as "imperialism" and predicts a proletarian victorious revolution after the impending imperialist war; the United States is designated as imperialist (J.A. 1520-1522). In *State and Revolution* (Ex. 139, p. 6), Lenin explains in the preface that the Russian Revolution of 1917 "can be understood in its totality only as a link in the chain of Socialist proletarian revolutions called forth by the imperialist war." Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* (Ex. 121, p. 15) develops the idea further to show that "imperialism" has made the revolution inevitable and has provided favorable conditions for it (see J.A. 1429, 1433-1434). In *Problems of Leninism* (Ex. 138, p. 9), he indicates that Leninism provides "suitable and obligatory" theory and tactics for the proletarian revolution against "imperialism" (J.A. 1503).

In 1927, the Communist International issued a "Resolution On The American Question" (Ex. 43) which states that "The United States of America, during the last decade, has developed into the mightiest imperialist power" (J.A. 1352); and, that the task of the Communist Party is "to form a broad united front and to intensify the struggle against American imperialism" (J.A. 1352). The *Resolution* lists the policy of the United States in China and its attitude against the Soviet Union among the questions that

"must" be utilized by the Party to rally the broad masses in defense of the Soviet Union and in its struggle against American imperialism (J.A. 1353).

The evidence summarized above is illustrative of a quantity of evidence which establishes that it is fundamental to Marxism-Leninism and to the world Communist movement led by the Soviet Union that all countries other than those of a victorious socialist revolution—which encompasses only the Soviet Union and those brought within its orbit—are characterized as "imperialist", against which the Communist Parties must wage the "struggle against imperialism".

In addition to the voluminous documentary evidence of record, Respondent's continuous adherence to these fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and of the world Communist movement is established by the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses based upon their experiences as members and officials of Respondent; upon directions they received while in the Party and the instruction they gave as teachers in the party; and upon their study of official Party publications. The more significant oral testimony is summarized as hereinafter set forth.

While Petitioner's witness Gitlow was a high officer of Respondent, until 1929, its aims and purposes were: to defend the Soviet Union as the fatherland of the working class of the world; to carry out the orders and directives of the Communist International; and to work for the undermining of the foundations of the American government in order to make it possible for Respondent to overthrow our form of government and set up in its place a dictatorship patterned after that which operates in the Soviet Union today (J.A. 225-226).

In 1932 (J.A. 351), Petitioner's witness Kornfeder, a former leading official of Respondent, taught in a school at the Party headquarters that the main doctrine of Lenin called for the complete and total overthrow of all existing social institutions, the government, the existing organizations that support the government, the complete elimina-

tion of the present state structure and its replacement by a dictatorship led by Respondent (J.A. 351-352).

Petitioner's witness Nowell was taught at the Lenin School in Moscow in 1932, and subsequently he himself taught in Respondent's schools in 1933 and 1934 in the United States, that the Government of the United States was the executive committee of the capitalist class in the United States and was subject to the same Marxism-Leninism laws of growth, development and decay as all capitalist states; that the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat were necessary and equally as inevitable in the United States as in other capitalist countries; that it was the duty of the Communists to work for the overthrow of the Government of the United States and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, following the form of the Soviet, and under the hegemony of Respondent and the Communist International; and, that it was the necessary duty of Respondent, as a part of world Communism, to work for the overthrow of the other "imperialist" nations (J.A. 383-387; 388-392).

Petitioner's witness Meyer taught in Respondent's schools until near the end of 1945 (J.A. 684). He instructed the members of Respondent that Marxism-Leninism is a guide to Respondent in carrying out its *historical role or mission* to overthrow the capitalist system and political states founded on the capitalist system, to destroy the economic organization on which that society is founded and its political system, and to replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat, to establish the kind of socialism that will lead to Communism (J.A. 729).

Petitioner's witness Johnson was taught at Respondent's training school in about 1932 that it was the duty of the Communists to build themselves up to the position where they could challenge the power of the government, and that the Red Army would not hesitate to throw its weight into the scales to tip the balance in favor of the Communist revolutionists in America; also, that the Communists should agitate and work for the demoralization of the armed forces of the United States by convincing them that

they must refuse to fight against the Soviet Red Army and go over on the side of the Red Army using their guns against the government of the United States and all forces that remained loyal to it (J.A. 652-653). This was the policy of Respondent throughout Johnson's membership, until 1940, and was elaborated upon by such leaders as Foster, Bedacht, Bittelman, Browder and Stachel, at committee meetings and conventions (J.A. 653). It is significant that Foster is the present national chairman of Respondent and some of these others are still high officials (see pages 36-38 herein).

Petitioner's witness Lautner who was a member of Respondent until 1950, and Petitioner's witness Janowitz who was a member at the time of testifying in this proceeding, corroborate this evidence (J.A. 947-948, 1023).

Petitioner's witness Matusow stated the aims and objectives of Respondent in case of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union were not to support the American "imperialists". The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States would have to be accomplished by violent means because "the ruling class would not give up its power" (J.A. 1055). While in the Party (1947 to 1951), he did not hear or see anything to indicate a change in the aims of Respondent. He refers to a statement of Izzy Brown, Club Education Director of the Friedlander Youth Club in New York in 1948, that it was the policy of Respondent not to support the United States in an "imperialist war" against the Soviet Union (J.A. 1057-1058).

Petitioner's witness Scarlettto relates a discussion in the latter part of 1950 by Party members in which it was felt advisable that members go into the service of the United States in the Korean War because they would be in a position to sabotage the United States effort (J.A. 1088-1089). At a meeting about the middle of November 1950 of functionaries of the Mexican Concentration Club, a suggestion was made to raise money through a neutral country for the North Koreans. The chairman of the Club at a meet-

ing in the latter part of 1950, told witness Scarlétto that it would be a good idea if he went back into the Navy Air Corps where he would have a good opportunity to sabotage. At a meeting of a Party club about December 1, 1950, the chairman reported American officers had been killed by their Korean orderlies. There were several expressions of satisfaction over this and the report that the war was going against the Americans at the time (J.A. 1089-1090).

Petitioner's witness Evans, a member of Respondent from 1948 to 1952, was taught that in a war between the Soviet Union and the United States all members of Respondent should help defeat the predatory aims of imperialism¹ (J.A. 1114).

In the years between 1945 and 1950, Petitioner's witnesses Cummings (J.A. 852-853), Hidalgo (J.A. 868), Blanc (J.A. 813) Markward (J.A. 747) and Baldwin (J.A. 1015) were taught that the world was divided into two camps: the imperialists and the anti-imperialists (democracies); that Russia was anti-imperialist and democratic; that the wars of the imperialists were unjust wars and the wars of the anti-imperialists were just wars; that in a war between imperialists and anti-imperialists, the members of the CPUSA must aid the anti-imperialists; and that this would hold true in the case of a war between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Documentary evidence of Respondent's expressions confirms the oral testimony that Respondent's policy is to oppose many United States policies and activities as imperialists, and as aggressive against the Soviet Union; also, that Respondent's policy is to support the Soviet Union and defeat the aims of imperialism (See Exs. 144, 148, 155, 158, 343, 427). *Political Affairs* for March 1951 describes President Truman's activities as "imperialism" on the way to bankruptcy and as a provocative semi-mobili-

¹ The organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March 1950 stated that while imperialism exists there also exists the danger of new aggression and that in the presence of imperialism and its predatory plans wars are unavoidable. (*Pravda*, Ex. 217, J.A. 1580).

zation for an outright war against the Soviet Union (Ex. 479).

A pattern throughout the world Communist movement for teaching; advocating, and agitating for the overthrow of "imperialist" governments exists in the concept or slogan that the world is divided into two hostile camps, one led by the Soviet Union and the other by the United States. As previously herein set forth, Lenin, Stalin, and the Communist International, in interpreting and adapting to the world Communist movement the writings of Marx and Engels, took the original concept that society is divided between the bourgeoisie and proletariat, and developed it into the doctrine or slogan that the world is divided into two hostile camps—the camp of the imperialist states and the camp of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR. In the *Programme of The Communist International* (Ex. 125) this is explained as follows (J.A. 1447):

"The difference in class structure and in the class character of the government in the two camps, the fundamental differences in the aims each pursues in internal, foreign, economic and cultural policy, the fundamentally different courses of their development, brings the capitalist world into sharp conflict with the victorious proletariat State. * * * The class struggle, which hitherto was conducted in circumstances when the proletariat was not in possession of State power, is now being conducted on an enormous and really world scale; the working class of the world has now its own State—the one and only fatherland of the international proletariat. * * * " (pp. 24 and 25).

* * * * *

(J.A. 1448):

"Thus, as a result of the first round of imperialist wars a new, fundamental antagonism has arisen of world historical scope and significance; the antagonism between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist world." (p. 25).

The record establishes a consistent advancement of this doctrine or slogan by the Soviet Union and by the Communist Information Bureau and its acceptance and use by Respondent. Of late, the slogan of "peace" has been added as hereinafter covered.

The Soviet Union in January, 1949 characterized the post-war foreign policy of the United States and Great Britain as one of aggression and unleashing a new war for world domination, whereas, it stated the Soviet Union struggles for universal peace and international security (Ex. 251). This position of the Soviet Union as reported in *Pravda*, points out that "The very existence of the Soviet State, with its growing power and its international authority, and likewise the powerful support given to it by the democratic forces in other countries constitute an insurmountable barrier in the way of all plans of any kind for the establishment of world domination by one power or another." (Ex. 251, p. 19, J.A. 1588).

Pravda for March 11, 1950 (Ex. 217) contains a speech by V. M. Molotov which states that "Since the October Revolution in our country, the victory of the national liberation movement in China appears as a new and most powerful blow at the entire system of world imperialism and at all plans of imperialist aggression in our time.", (J.A. 1579) and "Now the Soviet Union has not only come out of international isolation but is also the center of the powerful international democratic camp. * * * In the capitalist countries themselves we now have millions of active friends who are closing ranks more and more in a broad democratic, anti-imperialist movement." (p. 5 of Ex. 217, J.A. 1579). * * * "The democratic camp, which unites the USSR and the countries of the people's democracy, is opposed by the camp of the imperialist powers headed by the ruling circles of the United States of America." (J.A. 1579) (emphasis added).

For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy issue of November 10, 1947, sets forth a speech delivered by A. Zhd-

anov¹ at the Informative Conference of the Nine Communist Parties held in Poland at the end of September 1947. A section of this speech is entitled: "The New Post-War Alignment of political Forces and the Formation of Two Camps: the Imperialist and the Anti Democratic Camp, and the Anti-Imperialist and Democratic one" wherein it is stated the principal driving force of the imperialist camp is the United States with whom Great Britain and France are allied; the second camp—anti-imperialist—is based on the USSR and the "new democracies". (Ex. 214-A, J.A. 1576).

For a Lasting Peace, issue of March 10, 1950, contains an article which concludes with the following (J.A. 1732):

"A comparison of the economic successes achieved by the Peoples' Democracies in a very short period of their history with the extremely difficult position of the working people in the capitalist countries constitutes a terrible indictment of American imperialism and of the whole decaying capitalist system." (Ex. 412, p. 1).

With respect to Respondent, when Petitioner's witness Lautner left the Party at the end of 1949, the Party line was that the United States headed the imperialist forces of the world and that Russia led the anti-imperialist forces and that everything should be done to aid Russia and to disconcert the United States (J.A. 947-948). Further, in 1949 an instructor in courses on the ABC's of Marxism included the United States in the imperialist camp (J.A. 747) and a similar position was taken by a Party group in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1948, where it was stated that the United States led the "imperialists" and the Soviet Union led the anti-imperialists or People's Democracies (J.A. 777-782).

A "Discussion Outline" on "The Marxist Position To-

¹ The Zhdanov Report has recently been widely used and followed by Respondent. It was published in *Political Affairs* (J.A. 970-972) and discussed and studied throughout the Party while Lautner and Philbrick were members (J.A. 777-778, 970-972). It is variously listed as "required reading" (Ex. 424), "reading material" (Ex. 399), and "reading", in study and teaching materials used by Respondent in 1949.

ward War" issued by Respondent's Educational Department, Michigan State Committee, in April 1949. (Ex. 400) has a section entitled (J.A. 1731-1732):

"IV. World War II was Just War" which says in part:

"The post-war world was split by the U.S. and Britain into two camps—the camp of imperialism and fascism under the leadership of American imperialism and the camp of democracy, national freedom and peace, headed by the USSR." (p. 4).

Similar teachings by Respondent are evidenced by study and teaching material used in various schools and groupings. (Ex. 425, p. 16; Ex. 424, Session 9, J.A. 1753-1754).

Related to the concept of the world being divided into two hostile camps, is the concept or slogan set forth by Lenin and Stalin that distinguishes between "just wars", which are those carried on by "anti-imperialist" nations, and "unjust wars", i.e., those engaged in solely by "imperialist" nations among themselves or against any "socialist" country, such as the Soviet Union. We find that the concept of "just" and "unjust" wars, requiring the Communist Parties to support the Soviet Union in a war between the Soviet Union and any other country, and in a war between the Soviet Union and their own country to use every means to assist the Soviet Union, is basic to Marxism-Leninism; and that it has been continuously advanced and advocated by the Soviet Union, and has been continuously taught and followed by Respondent. Respondent's policies and activities centering around the doctrine of "just" and "unjust" wars is covered later in this report in connection with the issue as to what country the leaders of Respondent consider they owe allegiance. Accordingly, it is sufficient at this point to state our finding that Respondent's teachings and advocacy of this line represent a continued following of directions as to the line from Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International, and the Soviet Union.

We proceed to review the evidence concerning Respondent's use of the words "peace" and "democracy" in connection with the struggle against "imperialism" and for the advancement of the aims and objectives of the world Communist movement. Earlier in this report we have reviewed the united-front tactic as set forth in Marxism-Leninism as one of the means used for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. The united front has taken various approaches throughout the period since 1919. In the interest of reasonable summarization of the record, we limit this report to the use of the united-front tactic from 1935 on.

In 1935, the Communist International, which Respondent represented (J.A. 485-486, 841; Ex. 185), mapped out the "tactical line" for the years ahead which consisted of forming a "united-front" with other organizations in order to achieve national unity in the various countries for the purpose of combatting fascism.¹ (Ex. 137). The record shows that early in the 1930's, Stalin, in a report on behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU to its Party Congress, pointed out that "the Bourgeoisie would seek a way out of the economic crisis, on the one hand, by crushing the working class through the establishment of fascist dictatorship, i.e., the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most imperialistic capitalist elements." (Ex. 330, pp. 300-301, J.A. 1627). The record also shows that the Soviet Union realized a "second imperialist war" represented a serious danger to the USSR. (Ex. 330, pp. 334-5, J.A. 1627-1628). In mid-1935, discussions were started in the Communist International on the matter of the united front—the "anti-Fascist front"—which were supported by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as evidenced by an article in the August 6, 1935, issue of *Pravda*; this points out that "Unity—that is the command of the moment" and emphasizes "that this unity be directed against Fascism, against the danger of a new imperialist war, against the offensive of capital", while also

¹ In Communist documents, fascism is a form of imperialism.

emphasizing that the Communist "know that only the dictatorship of the proletariat, only the Soviet Government is the sole salvation of the working class * * *" (Ex. 183, J.A. 1566).

Thus, it is more than a coincidence that the Communist International in 1935 gave the reasons for developing the "new tactical orientation", the economic crisis facing capitalism, the offensive of fascism, and the growth of the threat of a new imperialist war and of an attack on the USSR (Ex. 137, pp. 21-22). In a speech at the close of this meeting of the Comintern, Georgi Dimitrov pointed out that "Ours is a Congress of struggle for the preservation of peace, against the threat of imperialist war." (J.A. 1443) and that (J.A. 1494):

"Standing firmly on the impregnable position of Marxism-Leninism, which has been confirmed by the entire experience of the international labor movement, and primarily by the victories of the great October Revolution, our Congress, acting in the spirit and guided by the method of living Marxism-Leninism, has reshape the tactical lines of the Communist International to meet the changed world situation." (*ibid*, p. 11)

The Resolution of the Comintern concerning the new approach or use of the united-front tactic lays down various things which the Communist Parties are to do in carrying out the revised line, and in that connection uses such words as "enjoins" (p. 26), "must" (p. 36), and "imperative" (p. 37). The record shows that Respondent fully and completely complied with this line laid down by the Communist International as evidenced by the following, which is among the more significant evidence of record on this point.

In November 1935 the Central Committee of Respondent adopted a resolution "fully and wholeheartedly" endorsing

¹ The speech of Dimitrov and the Resolutions adopted by the Comintern were printed in pamphlet form in the United States by Workers Library Publishers and have been widely used by Respondent. (J.A. 441-442, 957-959, Ex. 427; Ex. 346 (see J.A. 790)).

the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in which resolution the "chief task" of Respondent at the time is stated to be "to reorientate the work of the Party in accord with the tactical line of the Seventh World Congress" and in which "The Central Committee calls upon the Party organizations and every Party member to prosecute the struggle for the united front with the utmost determination and flexibility in the *new way* pointed out by the Seventh World Congress." (emphasized in text) (Ex. 185, 1182-1184, J.A. 1570). Like the resolution of the Comintern and the statements of the Soviet Union, Respondent's resolution takes care to point out that the line is an application "in a living way" of "the teachings of Marx, Lenin, Engels and Stalin"; and that it is linked to the prosecution of the Party's "revolutionary aims" and "revolutionary principles and program." (*ibid.*, p. 1185) (See also: Witness Mosely (J.A. 533-536); Lautner (J.A. 988)).

Some of the details of Respondent's compliance with the instructions of the Communist International are furnished by Petitioner's witness Nowell who in the latter part of 1935 was instructed by William Weinstone and other functionaries of the Michigan District of Respondent to proceed to set up certain organizations in accordance with the united front policy and conforming to the new type of reorientation, as set forth in the resolutions of the Comintern. The witness shows that he carried out these instructions by forming fractions in various organizations for the purpose of influencing the policies of the organizations and to guide them along the lines of the Communist Party in setting up the "united front" movement (J.A. 392-397).

In 1936, Respondent's Central Committee issued a statement which was printed in Respondent's magazine, *The Communist*, issue for May 1936 (Ex. 380-B); calling upon all workers to unite to defeat fascism and on May Day to pledge to defend the Soviet Union. *The Communist* for May 1940 carries an article by "Gene Dennis" which points out the danger to the Soviet Union from the imperialist war and states that the united front can only be achieved

successfully if consistently directed against the imperialist war and capitalist reaction (Ex. 436, pp. 404, 405).

Some aspects of Respondent's line during the period of the second world war shifted back and forth to follow the position of the Soviet Union. The pertinent facts in this respect are covered in our findings under the section of this report on the issue of non-deviation; we have taken them into consideration as part of the pertinent evidence involving Respondent's following of foreign directions concerning the use of the united front tactic. The record shows that after World War II, the use of the united front tactic received a different emphasis in the form of the united front for "peace". The testimony of Petitioner's witness Lautner, which is corroborated by other evidence of record, furnishes a clear understanding of this aspect of the issues and is therefore pertinent for review in some detail. The witness testified in part as follows, which we find to be an accurate statement of the facts:

"The United Front tactics of the Communist Party were part of the subject-matter of Marxism-Leninism, and in class [referring to Party classes in 1948] we tried to convey the idea that the Seventh World Congress decisions pertaining to the United Front tactics and Dimitrov's report in no way eliminated or negated the decisions of the Sixth World Congress but implemented the decisions of the Sixth World Congress in a way to enable the party to develop a wider base on specific issues. Before the Seventh World Congress, we had United Fronts that were based on a narrow concept popularly known as United Front from Below, United Fronts on specific issues, but were elements that were ready and willing to work on specific issues with the Communist movement. In the main it was an effort to increase and to advance the influence of the Communist Parties. This policy, based on the strategy and tactics of the Sixth World Congress, was a failure of the party in Germany to make headway, the defeat suffered by the German Party, based on the strategy and

tactics and the program of the Sixth World Congress, the failure in China, the failure to build the Red International Trade Union movement, the failure to gain a way or win a way to working classes, the organized section of the working classes from the influence of social democracy, with the result that reaction gained power in a number of countries. Hitler came to power in Germany. The Seventh World Congress devised a new tactical approach in order to achieve the main strategic objectives by developing a program of United Front from below and from above, and also the program of the people's fronts and coalitions around a specific issue in the struggle against fascism and in the struggle against war; because fascism was the main danger of war at that time.

* * *

"So The United Front is not a repudiation of the basis [sic] strategic aims of the Communist movement, but as step that will bring closer the realization of that strategic aim.

* * *

"After 1945 there came a re-evaluation of the world situation. Now the problem was to find that link in the chain again with which a new coalition could be developed on a united front basis, on a minimum program, on a partial program of the Communist International, with which coalition we could go forward to a new milestone, to a new point and gain new adherents to the Communist movement, and when we reached that milestone there would be a new situation, a new realignment of forces, and we would find that new link with which we could go forward again. *This link after the second world war was the struggle for peace.* The question of peace was the new link. At the reconstitution convention Foster in his report already indicated the direction in which the Party will travel in this postwar period, and Zhdanov's report later on precisely sets the two world camps and the main issue in the coming period, the issue of peace. That is the new link today

around which the Party develops its activities to broaden out and to bring about an alinement of forces on the basis on which it can extend its influence and exert its influence among the broader section of the population of this country." (J.A. 957-960) (underlining added)

The record clearly shows that the Communist Parties throughout the world, including the Respondent in the United States, are now actively and strongly presenting the line of "peace", particularly the united front in the "struggle for peace". The very name of the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau, which is *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, is indicative thereof. Key material used by Respondent in forming its "peace" line is the Zhdanov report, previously mentioned (see p. 80 and footnote 1), from which a typical quotation is as follows (J.A. 1576):

"All the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist camp are united in the effort to secure a just and democratic peace. * * * These countries, and in the first place the new democracies * * * have proved themselves in the post-war period staunch defenders of peace, democracy and their own liberty and independence against all attempts on the part of the United States and Great Britain to turn them back in their course and to bring them again under the imperialist yoke." (Ex. 214-A, p. 2).

The position or line of the Soviet Union in this matter is evidenced by a report delivered by G. M. Malenkov at the meeting of the Moscow Soviet in November 1949 and printed in the November 11, 1949 issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*. In this report, Malenkov devoted a substantial portion to the heading "The Soviet Union Stands for Peace and Defends the Cause of Peace" (Ex. 231, p. 1, J.A. 1582). He points out that there is not a single country in which the movement uniting the sup-

porters of peace does not possess a "base" (J.A. 1583) and that the successes of "the camp of peace" drives the "enemies of peace", "by means of violence and new wars", to attempt the creation of an American world empire designed to turn the whole world into a "colony of the American imperialists, of reducing sovereign peoples to a state of slavery" (J.A. 1583).

The December 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* contains a condensed translation from the Soviet philosophical journal *Voprosi Filosofie* which is entitled: "Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It". This Soviet statement, which by its publication in *Political Affairs* and in view of the entire record, makes it reasonable to conclude that it was adopted by Respondent and thus becomes the line of Respondent and is very similar in content to the above-mentioned Zhdanov and Malenkov reports. The statement outlines various forms which "the struggle for peace" has taken, such as fighting for an end to the war in Korea, against rearming West Germany and Japan, and a ban on atomic weapons. It also quotes with approval a declaration by Joseph Stalin in 1946 to the effect that "the peoples" are taking the fate of their states in their own hands and establishing "democratic regimes" and "carrying on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against the incendiaries of a new war" (Ex. 488, p. 20).

Respondent's following of the line of the united front, and particularly the united front for peace, is evidenced by a quantity of documentary material probative of Respondent's policies and doctrines. Typical recent expressions of this line by Respondent appear in the *Daily Worker* issues of March 3, 1949 (Ex. 331), June 9, 1950 (Ex. 269), July 13, 1950 (Ex. 270), September 18, 1950 (Ex. 440), February 19, 1951 (Ex. 451), April 1, 1951 (Ex. 455), October 19, 1951 (Ex. 467), November 7, 1951 (Ex. 468), and June 9, 1952 (Ex. 495). The issue of November 7, 1950 contains the following as part of an editorial:

"Today the Soviet Union is indestructible. The work of Lenin and Stalin is immortal. The Socialist

State has become the leader of a new force in modern history—the great camp of peace. This new alliance of hundreds of millions of people in China and the People's Democracies, together with the vast millions in the colonial and capitalist countries, can prevent war. This is the new achievement of the Soviet Union, the glorious vision that the people can make a reality.” (Pet. Ex. 468)

Recent indications of Respondent's following of this united front for peace line also appear in *Political Affairs* for November 1950 (Ex. 477), February 1951 (Ex. 376), April 1951 (Ex. 480), December 1951 (Ex. 488), and January 1952 (Ex. 489). The issue of February 1951 (Pet. Ex. 376; J.A. 1714-1718) contains “greetings” from Communist Parties of some thirty countries sent to Respondent on the occasion of its 15th National Convention. These greetings condemn American imperialism and support the struggle for peace. The “greetings” from the Soviet Union says in part “May the international solidarity of the toilers in the struggle for peace, democracy and Socialism gather strength.” The People's Democratic Republic of China advised Respondent “As a result of common struggle of the people of the world and awakened people in the United States, American imperialism has met with huge defeats and will continue to meet with even bigger defeats.” The French Party pointed out that Respondent's decisions “taken in the light of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, will enable you to advance forward on the road of unity of action of the working class.” The Italian Party stated Respondent's struggle in defense of peace was greeted as its struggle. The German Democratic Republic said Respondent's fight is their fight “just as the struggle of the German friends of democracy and peace is your struggle”. The Party of Great Britain expressed its “solidarity” with Respondent in the common struggle against Anglo-American imperialism. The Canadian Party expressed certainty that “Headed by the Mighty Socialist

Soviet Union * * * the world camp of peace is going forward to win" and that Respondent "will not be found wanting".

Respondent's teaching materials used in its training schools and for self-study by the members furnish, among other things, still further evidence on the following of the united front for peace line. The "Discussion Outline" on "The Marxist Position Toward War" (*Supra*, pp. 90-91 of this report) put out in 1949 devotes considerable space to "Peace" and lists works by Lenin and Stalin and the *History of the CPSU (B)* as reading material. The "Outline For Nine-Day School", issued in 1948 (Ex. 346, J.A. 1663-1664), has as the topic for the third lesson "Imperialism-War-Fascism-Struggle For Peace" and lists Lenin's *Imperialism* and the *United Front Against Fascism* as the reading material. Part II of the Study Outline for the Marxist Institute, issued in 1949 (Ex. 427, J.A. 1754-1757) includes the study of the tactics of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International and teaches that in the present period the strategic objective remains the same but the tactical line of the united front and peoples coalition developed still further, citing Dimitrov's report to the 7th World Congress as required reading and the *History of the CPSU (B)* as supplemental reading (Session 9, pp. 1-3).

We find based on the foregoing and upon the entire record, that "the struggle for peace" including the tactic of the united front for peace, is presently a main line of Respondent, the Soviet Union, and the Communist Information Bureau, and that this line is based upon the tactics set forth in Marxism-Leninism. It is therefore important to consider what the Communists mean by "peace", as an aid in determining whether the "peace" line is a link or tactic in seeking to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement. The testimony of Petitioner's witness Lautner regarding the united front tactic as heretofore set forth is relevant to this matter. Also, the *History of the CPSU (B)* teaches (J.A. 1618):

"The Bolsheviks were not mere pacifists who sighed for peace and confined themselves to the propaganda of peace, as the majority of the Left Social-Democrats did. The Bolsheviks advocated an active revolutionary struggle for peace, to the point of overthrowing the rule of the bellicose imperialist bourgeoisie. The Bolsheviks linked up the cause of peace with the cause of the victory of the proletarian revolution, holding that the surest way of ending the war and securing a just peace, a peace without annexations and indemnities, was to overthrow the rule of the imperialist bourgeoisie" (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 167).

The *History* further teaches that to achieve "peace" the Communist Parties should convert imperialist war into civil war and defeat one's own government in an imperialist war (J.A. 1618-1619).

The understanding of the "struggle for peace" as an active, revolutionary struggle is further evidenced from a resolution adopted in 1935 by the Comintern, which resolution reads in part as follows (J.A. 1498):

"At the present historical juncture, when on one-sixth part of the globe the Soviet Union defends socialism and peace for all humanity, the most vital interests of the workers and toilers of all countries demand that in pursuing the policy of the working class, in waging the struggle for peace, the struggle against imperialist war before and after the outbreak of hostilities, the defense of the Soviet Union must be considered paramount" (Ex. 137, p. 48).

These tactics are also revealed in Dimitroff's *The United Front*, a part of the body of Marxism-Leninism, which says, *inter alia* (J.A. 1547):

"... You cannot carry on a real struggle against fascism if you do not render all possible assistance in strengthening the most important buttress of this struggle, the Soviet Union. You cannot carry on a

serious struggle against fascism instigators of a new world blood bath, if you do not render undivided support to the USSR, a *most important factor* in the maintenance of international peace . . . ” (Ex. 149, p. 279, emphasized in text).

Additional insight into Respondent's use of the “struggle for peace” is furnished by the aforementioned “greeting” sent to Respondent by the Soviet Union on the occasion of Respondent's 15th National Convention in late 1951. This “greeting” is later herein discussed in more detail with respect to the issue of Respondent's reporting to the Soviet Union. Petitioner's witness Lautner, based on his experiences as a member of Respondent including what he taught and was taught, considers the greeting “a political document of the highest importance” (J.A. 994), which raises all the basic questions that Respondent is confronted with at the present time and “gives leadership to the American Party” (J.A. 994-995). Lautner interprets “struggle for peace, democracy and socialism” as “the new tactical approach since the end of the war, the link with which this tactical united front is to be built.” (J.A. 995); and so we conclude.

In view of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that the “struggle for peace” as used and practiced by Respondent, sometimes called the “struggle against reaction”, represents the present emphasis of the “struggle against imperialism” which is and has been a basic, active, revolutionary doctrine taught and advocated by Respondent for the purpose of overthrowing “imperialist” governments (by force and violence if necessary) and substituting the dictatorship of the proletariat. - We further conclude and find that Respondent's “struggle for peace”, “struggle against imperialism” and united front tactics followed in connection therewith, represent a continued following of directives of the Soviet Union as contained in Marxism-Leninism, in specific instructions of the Soviet Union and in the program of the

Communist International; and are designed to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement.

4. Democratic Centralism and Self-Criticism

Respondent's use of the organizational principle known as "Democratic Centralism", hereinbefore referred to under "Marxism-Leninism", is one of the many facts indicative of its operation pursuant to directives from the Soviet Union through which the policies of the Soviet Union are effectuated.

The *Programme of the Communist International* covers democratic centralism as follows (J.A. 1465-1466):

"The Communist International and its Sections are built up on the basis of democratic centralism, the fundamental principles of which are: (a) election of all leading committees of the Party * * *; (b) periodical reports by leading Party committees to their constituents; (c) decisions of superior Party committees to be obligatory for subordinate committees, strict Party discipline and prompt execution of the decisions of the Communist International, of its leading committees and of the leading Party centres.

"Party questions may be discussed by the members of the Party and by Party organizations until such time as a decision is taken upon them by the competent Party committees. After a decision has been taken by the Congress of the Communist International, by the Congress of the respective Sections, or by leading committees of the Comintern, and of its various Sections; these decisions must be unreservedly carried out even if a Section of the Party membership or of the local Party organizations are in disagreement with it." (Ex. 125, p. 86)

Respondent admittedly follows and applies the principle of democratic centralism.¹ It has done so substantially

¹ Respondent's witness Gates says democratic centralism is the principle which governs the party organization and function. He does not, however, indicate its origin (J.A. 1204).

throughout most of its existence. In 1945, when Respondent was reconstituted as the Communist Party, its leader, William Z. Foster, proclaimed:

“ * * * Only by applying the sound principles of Leninist democratic-centralism can our Party keep its mistakes to a minimum and develop the clear-thinking unity of action and resolute discipline that are the great strength of Communist parties all over the world.” (Ex. 372, p. 793).

Respondent's position with respect to the issue of democratic centralism is as expressed by its counsel in arguing before us: “What has all that got to do with domination and control by Moscow?” (R. 1708). Respondent's evidence is to the effect that the principle of democratic centralism is the ultimate in democracy in that the rank and file members elect the next higher officers and so on up to the highest authority of the Party—the national convention. Respondent states that once a decision is reached by the majority, that decision is binding on the whole body (J.A. 965-966; 1204-1205).

Witnesses for the Petitioner testify to a different understanding of democratic centralism.

Gitlow stated (J.A. 217): “The Communist Party in the United States was a centralized organization, ruled from the top down, and not from the bottom up;” and when he, Lovestone and Wolf were deposed in the schism of 1929, arrangements were made in Moscow that control of the United States party was to be vested in a representative of the Communist International who was given specific power to nullify any decision that any committee or any branch of the CPUSA made. He was also given power to expel any member of the party as well as other powers over the party (J.A. 270).

Kornfeder likened the party structure to a military one, with power coming from above (J.A. 306).

Nowell testified that, during his membership (between

1929 and 1936), in actual practice authority descends upon the membership from the top (J.A. 353).

We find that the materiality and relevancy of the issue of democratic centralism lies in its source as concerns Respondent's acceptance and practice of it, and in its use as a means of bringing Respondent within the authority of the Soviet Union. The record leaves no real doubt that, at least until 1940, Respondent followed democratic centralism as a requirement of membership in the Communist International,¹ and that on the basis of democratic centralism all decisions of the Communist International had to be fulfilled by Respondent (Ex. 145, p. 24; Ex. 125, p. 86; J.A. 1535-1537, 1464, 1658). From this it follows, based on the evidence elsewhere herein set forth, that for the period covering over twenty years of Respondent's existence, the principle of democratic centralism was one of the means whereby Respondent came within the authority of the Soviet Union.² Upon consideration of all of the evidence concerning Respondent's policies, activities, and conduct over the subsequent period of its existence, particularly the evidence covering nondeviation and allegiance as elsewhere set forth in this report, it is reasonable to conclude, and we do so, that Respondent's continued following of the principle of democratic centralism keeps Respondent within the authority of the Soviet Union.

We further find that the principle of democratic centralism is one of the policies established by the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, through adaptations of Marxism-Leninism, as an organizational Policy of the world Communist movement, and that Respondent's operations based upon the following of the principle evidences the purpose to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union and of the world Communist movement.

In making our findings and conclusions concerning democratic centralism, we have taken into consideration the

¹ See pages 18 to 25 concerning the Communist International and Respondent's membership therein.

² See pages 50 to 53 herein.

disciplinary aspect of the principle which is treated later in this report.¹ We have also taken into consideration the evidence concerning the collateral Marxist-Leninist concept or device called self-criticism, as followed and understood by Respondent. In arguing about self-criticism before us, Respondent's counsel stated as follows concerning self-criticism:

"Another instruction or directive that the recommended decision relies on is what the Marxists call self-criticism. What is self-criticism? You get it from the books that are in evidence here. You get it from testimony of the witnesses. It is the proposition that Marxists assert that any serious political party should be willing openly to admit its mistakes, should discuss its mistakes of the past openly, and in the course of such public and open discussion also decide how those mistakes should be corrected. That is all that this principle of self-criticism means." (R. Jan. 7, 1953, p. 54)

The record, however, shows that the source of the doctrine and its use by Respondent lies in Marxism-Leninism and has as its primary purpose keeping Communists in line with the policies of the Soviet Union. As elsewhere herein noted, Respondent in 1945 re-emphasized the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and expelled Earl Browder as a "revisionist" (J.A. 1136-1151). Those who had supported Browder engaged in "self-criticism" by saying that they were wrong in adhering to Browder's de-emphasis of the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and in committing the other errors pointed out by Jacques Duclos, a spokesman for the world Communist movement (J.A. 1574-1575, 1692-1694; Exs. 208, 372).

¹ This includes the evidence furnished by Petitioner's witness Johnson and others which establishes that in the past Respondent's organization included a Central Control Commission—the national disciplinary body—which was the American section of the International Control Commission in Moscow that maintained the strictest, iron discipline in the Party and kept every Communist in line (J.A. 647-648, 659-660, 1470-1471).

"Self criticism" is a device for safeguarding the unity of the Party and the iron discipline required by the Soviet Union. Elsewhere herein we discuss the evidence on these points in more detail. It is pertinent here to set forth a few illustrations from the record. Respondent's *Manual on Organization* contains the following:¹

"It is clear, however, that basic principles and decisions, such, as for example, the Program of the Communist International, cannot be questioned in the Party. (Ex. 145, p. 26, J.A. 1537

"We do not question the correctness of the revolutionary theory of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin." (*ibid*, pp. 26 and 27, J.A. 1537).

"Self-criticism is a natural part of the life of the Party * * *. Without self-criticism, there can be no Communist Party. But this criticism must never depart from the line of the Party, from the principles of Marxism-Leninism. * * * destructive criticism * * * if tolerated * * * leads to factionalism." (*ibid*, pp. 32 and 33, J.A., 1538).

In short, the policies of the Soviet Union cannot be questioned.

An "Outline On Fundamentals of Marxism For Class Use or Self Study", issued by Respondent's National Educational Commission, cites Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* as the "source of unity and discipline in the Communist Party" and quotes from Lenin, *Selected Works*, on

¹ According to Respondent's witnesses, the *Manual* is obsolete in Party circles. On the other hand, the evidence furnished by witnesses Nowell, Crouch, Lautner and Budenz, and the fact that the author of the *Manual*, J. Peters, a high officer of Respondent, only left the United States and Party work in 1949, preponderates to establish the continued use of the *Manual* until at least 1949 (J.A. 398-400, 425-428, 431-432, 897-898, 905, 960-965, 1032, 1121).

the practice of self-criticism (Ex. 370, p. 31, J.A. 1688-1689), which is indicative of the source of Respondent's use of the doctrine. Further, an article in *Political Affairs* for January 1951 covering the main resolutions of Respondent's 15th National Convention, treats with the practice of criticism and self-criticism as "the inner law of Party development", (Ex. 378, p. 33) and includes the following:

"Thus the whole Party does not often enough participate in evaluating major developments and struggles; does not sufficiently learn from mistakes committed.

"This in turn leads to many 'independent' estimates which are not resolved into one single Party estimate. This tends to weaken Party discipline and the carrying out of Party decisions. (J.A. 1723).

"The 15th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., demonstrates the firm political unity of our Party. It calls upon the whole membership to guard the monolithic character and unity of our Party, based on democratic centralism. We must strive for the highest discipline arising out of conscious understanding of the Party's theory and political line. Tendencies toward factionalism are totally impermissible and must be sharply dealt with because they weaken the Party and make it possible for the enemy more easily to penetrate its ranks" (J.A. 1723-1724).

In view of the foregoing and upon consideration of the evidence concerning discipline and allegiance as later in this report reviewed, and upon the record as a whole, we find and conclude that Respondent practices the doctrine of self-criticism in compliance with the requirements of the Soviet Union and for the purpose of keeping its members in line with the policies and directives laid down by the Soviet Union.

5. Foreign Representatives in the United States

The foregoing facts concerning Respondent's organizational structure and the changes therein, the true meaning and use of Marxism-Leninism, and Respondent's policies and activities in "the struggle against imperialism" demonstrate and confirm the international character of the world Communist movement; that Respondent is the United States section or part of that movement; and, that the movement is dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union. Further confirmation and demonstration are found in the evidence concerning other activities or programs which the record establishes are the subjects of Respondent's major attention and efforts. These are hereinafter covered under the headings "Major Programs" and "The Communist Press".

We find that from time to time throughout Respondent's existence, the formulation and carrying out of its policies, programs, and activities as aforesaid have been directed or supervised by foreign representatives in the United States from the Soviet Union; this serves to illuminate and explain the basis and source of the policies and activities, and further illustrates the international aspects of Respondent's operations, as well as the foreign control thereover. A condition of the Communist International which was accepted and followed by Respondent was that (J.A. 1469-1470):

"The E.C.C.I. and its Presidium have the right to send their representatives to the various Sections of the Communist International. Such representatives receive their instructions from the E.C.C.I. or from its Presidium, and are responsible to them for their activities. Representatives of the E.C.C.I. have the right to participate in meetings of the central Party bodies as well as of the local organizations of the Sections to which they are sent. * * * Representatives of the E.C.C.I. are especially obliged to supervise the carrying out of the decisions of the World Congresses and

of the Executive Committee of the Communist International." Ex. 125, pp. 89 & 90)

It would unduly burden this report to trace the many instances of record where such foreign representatives have been in the United States and active in the affairs of Respondent. Among such representatives identified in the record are Gerhardt Eisler (sometimes known as Edwards and Hans Berger), (J.A. 321-325, 379, 424, 875-877, 1142-1143, 1186-1187), J. Peters (J.A. 398-400, 425-428, 431-432, 897-898, 905, 960-965, 1032, 1121, 1168), Pogany (John Pepper) (J.A. 255, 265, 315, 423), Golos (J.A. 263, 1163-1166), Peterson (J.A. 248), Frank Miller (J.A. 249), P. Green (Gussev) (J.A. 245-246), Yusefovich, Merker (Wagner) (J.A. 489-491, 1165-1166), Walettsky, and Allen (J.A. 491) (See also: J.A. 316-319, 338). Limiting this report to a few examples, the record supports the testimony of Petitioner's witness Johnson who testified, based on what he was taught in Respondent's training school in 1932, that a representative of the Comintern had power superseding that of any leader in the American Party and was the complete boss over Respondent's policy (J.A. 660-661). Similarly, Petitioner's witness Lautner shows that when a Comintern representative spoke at Party meetings, no one questioned his decisions and they were accepted as the Party line (J.A. 321-325, 461-462, 660-661, 692-693, 874, 969-970, 1140-1143).

In the light of the record, we find that many of the policies and activities presently being carried out by Respondent were originally formulated under the supervision of representatives of the Communist International, and that this fact is indicative of foreign domination and control of Respondent. This, however, is not the entire state of the record as to activities of foreign representatives. When viewed in the light of the facts that Respondent announced its disaffiliation from the Comintern in 1940 to avoid identification as a foreign agent in the United States, and that the dissolution of the Comintern was announced in 1943 as a tactical move for unity in World War II and to elimi-

nate that manifestation of foreign direction over the member Communist Parties, the less apparent but yet identifiable subsequent activities of foreign representatives in the United States becomes significant.

We have previously found that Manuilsky, while a Soviet Union representative to the United Nations in 1945, sent word to Respondent to the effect that it should heed Duclos' statement concerning the reconstitution of the Communist Party.¹ Other individuals who had previously been here as Communist International representatives are identified on the record as active in the United States after 1940. J. Peters and Gerhardt Eisler² are the subjects of considerable testimony.

Respondent's witness Flynn states on direct examination that since she assumed her duties as a member of the National Committee in 1938, Respondent has not received any directives or instructions from any representative of the CPSU and that to her knowledge no Communist International representative has been in the United States since 1946 (J.A. 1289). She knows Gerhardt Eisler but did not meet him until after his arrest. She states that neither he nor any of her fellow officers in the CPUSA ever told her that he (Eisler) was a representative of the Communist International. The testimony of Respondent's witness Gates is to the same effect (J.A. 1250-1251).

Of the reputed Communist International representatives in the United States, Eisler was the most conspicuous and most noteworthy. Eisler was in this country for many years and fled the United States while on bail, pending the appeal of his conviction in 1949 for false swearing. Witness Kornfeder shows that in 1933 Eisler, whom he had

¹ See *supra* page 30; see also J.A. 1137, 1182-1183.

² The record shows that both Peters and Eisler as well as other Comintern representatives have used various other names and aliases. Eisler has been known as "Edwards" and "Berger", (J.A. 424, 692-693, 1142-1143, 1163, 1186-1187), and on one occasion he asked witness Nowell to call him "Brown" (J.A. 379, 660). J. Peters was also known as William Peters, Alexander Stevens and Clarence Miller (J.A. 399). Also as Joe Peters, Alexander or Goldberg (J.A. 961).

originally met in Moscow, was a Comintern representative in the United States and discussed with him the infiltration of the American Federation of Labor and the Railroad Brotherhoods (J.A. 320-322). Eisler warned him of serious consequences if he spoke against a new trade union policy at a national convention of the Communist Party in 1934. Kornfeder disregarded Eisler's warning and was told to repudiate in the Party press within sixty days what he had said (J.A. 322-325). He was expelled from the Party (J.A. 325). Witness Johnson stated that Eisler's word was law in the CPUSA (J.A. 660-661). Witness Meyer knew Eisler as a Comintern representative (J.A. 692-693) as did witness Lautner (J.A. 874). Lautner testified that after 1945 he knew that Eisler undertook to influence Party activities in the United States (J.A. 969-970). Witness Budenz said that Stachel, a high Party leader, received orders from Eisler in 1943 and 1944 (J.A. 1162-1163) and that there was talk of Eisler as a Comintern representative in 1945. During this period Stachel consulted with Eisler frequently (J.A. 1140-1142).

Another person conspicuously active in the activities of the CPUSA was J. Peters, author of Respondent's *Manual On Organizgtion*. Witness Nowell identifies him as a Comintern representative (J.A. 376-378). Witness Crouch said he took orders from Peters between 1934 and 1940 (J.A. 426-428), and witnesses Johnson and Lautner testified that Peters provided them with secret codes (J.A. 664-665, 876-877).

Peters was deported in 1949. Subsequently, an official actively engaged in Respondent's youth activities met Peters in Hungary while the former was attending the World Youth Festival there (J.A. 1032, 1037-1038).

We find that the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses is credible and that the testimony of Respondent's witnesses is not in accord with the facts in this matter. A preponderance of the evidence clearly shows that representatives of the CPSU were in the United States and that through them Respondent received directives and instructions.

6. The Communist Press

In addition to the foregoing, further indication that the Respondent operates pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union, and is controlled by the Soviet Union in its views and policies, is furnished by the evidence hereinafter summarized concerning the Communist press and its use for the exchange of information. In the United States, the *Daily Worker* and *Political Affairs* operate as guides for the membership of Respondent as to the correct views and policies. (J.A. 336, 359, 464-465, 745, 767-768, 938-942, 1128-1130, 1309) In the Soviet Union, the organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a paper called *Pravda* (See Ex. 217). On an international scale, *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* is the organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties (Cominform).

We find that one significant aspect of the issue of domination and control lies in the formation, nature, and character of the *Daily Worker*. The record shows that the Communist International required the member parties to "create a new type of periodical press . . . in which the Communists . . . learn to utilize the slightest liberty allowed by the laws . . ." and without which "the preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible." (Ex. 8, p. 20, J.A. 1325). The International also required that such a Party press carry on a policy fully corresponding to the policy of the Party; edited by reliable Communists; and subject to the control of the governing body of the Party (*ibid.*, p. 27, J.A. 1325-1326). We find that the policy, content, and advocacy of the *Daily Worker* is and has been under the complete supervision and control of Respondent's leaders and top committees; that officers of Respondent have been the principal officers of the paper; that the paper's policies correspond to the policies of the Party and the paper is considered a necessity for the effectuation of the Party's aims and purposes (J.A. 940-943, 1134-1138, 1160-1161, 1176-1178). In its early years, the *Daily Worker* was aided by financial subsidies from Moscow and until

about 1944 was furnished free information or dispatches at nominal cost, from Moscow through a Soviet Union news service. The record shows various directives issued by the Communist International concerning the *Daily Worker*, which were followed. Upon consideration of the foregoing and upon the whole record, we find and conclude that the *Daily Worker* was established pursuant to directives of the Communist International and presently fulfills the function it has always had.

We further find, on the basis of the evidence hereinafter summarized, that the *Daily Worker* is the counterpart in the United States of the Soviet Union organ, *Pravda*, translated issues of which are part of the record in this proceeding. While Petitioner's witness Budenz was managing editor of the *Daily Worker* (1941-1945), staff meetings were held for political education—"to keep the staff on their toes regarding Party theory and thinking"—at which meetings the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* was used (J.A. 1160-1161). We have heretofore found that the *History* constitutes one of the principal sets of rules and guides followed by Respondent. It is stated in the *History* that, "A powerful instrument used by the Bolshevik Party to strengthen its organizations and to spread its influence among the masses was the Bolshevik daily newspaper *Pravda* . . . founded, according to Lenin's instructions, on the initiative of Stalin, Olminsky and Poletayev" (Ex. 330, p. 149, J.A. 1614-1618). The *History* also states that *Pravda* "directed the working class movement toward one definite aim—preparation for revolution" (*ibid*, p. 153) and that a legally published newspaper "could not call openly for the overthrow of tsardom" and "had to resort to hints, which, however, the class-conscious workers understood very well . . ." (*ibid*, p. 150, J.A. 1615). Examples are given of "modest" sounding words which were understood by the workers as a "call" (*ibid*, p. 151, J.A. 1616). Respondent's official concept of the *Daily Worker* in the 1930's, which the record shows still persists, is that the paper is "One of the main

and most important instruments of agitation and propaganda . . . for reaching and winning the masses." (Ex. 145, pp. 78-79, J.A. 1540). This is pertinent for comparison with the aforementioned concept of *Pravda* as "A powerful instrument used by the Bolshevik Party to . . . spread its influence among the masses."

We treat now with the issue as to whether the foreign Communist press contains articles or statements that constitute directives or instructions to Respondent. Respondent's witness Gates is a member of the National Committee, and is editor of the *Daily Worker*.¹ He denies that any foreign publication contains directives to the Respondent (J.A. 1208-1211). The testimony of Respondent's other two witnesses is to the same effect. On the other hand, while Petitioner's witness Budenz was managing editor of the *Daily Worker*, "the Communists looked in these articles from Moscow for the directives and the line that was to be pursued, the attitude that should be taken" (J.A. 1170-1171).

The direct oral testimony, however, is not the full state of the record in the premises. In resolving this issue, we have taken into consideration the facts elsewhere herein set forth concerning "non-deviation", and particularly, as established by a review of the pertinent documents of record, the fact that the *Daily Worker* does not deviate from or disagree with the Soviet press.² We have also taken into consideration the background of the Communist press in this country and in the Soviet Union as heretofore set forth, and the aforementioned principle that the press resorts to "hints" or "modest" language but which the "workers" understand. Further, it is not seriously disputed on the record that the *Daily Worker* receives political news from abroad, particularly from Moscow, which in-

¹ He held these positions prior to starting to serve a prison sentence for conviction in 1950 for violation of the Smith Act, and, as far as he knows, still retains the positions.

² Respondent's witness Gates says the similarity between Respondent's views and those of the Soviet Union is only the coincidence of the common application of Marxist-Leninist principles (J.A. 1252-1254).